

VZCZCXYZ0000
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUEHGV #0027/01 0400940
ZNY SSSSS ZZH
O R 090858Z FEB 10
FM USMISSION CD GENEVA
TO RHEFDIA/DIA WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RHEHAAA/NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RHMFISS/CJCS WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RHMFISS/CNO WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RHMFISS/DEPT OF ENERGY WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RHMFISS/DTRA ALEX WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RHMFISS/JOINT STAFF WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RUEAIIA/CIA WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RUEHNO/USMISSION USNATO IMMEDIATE 0042
RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC 0063
INFO RUEHGV/USMISSION CD GENEVA
RUEHKV/AMEMBASSY KYIV 0042
RUEHMO/AMEMBASSY MOSCOW 0042
RUEHTA/AMEMBASSY ASTANA 0042

S E C R E T CD GENEVA 000027

SIPDIS
DEPT FOR T, VCI AND EUR/PRA
DOE FOR NNSA/NA-24
CIA FOR WINPAC
JSCS FOR J5/DDGSA
SECDEF FOR OSD(P)/STRATCAP
NAVY FOR CNO-N5JA AND DIRSSP
AIRFORCE FOR HQ USAF/ASX AND ASXP
DTRA FOR OP-OS OP-OSA AND DIRECTOR
NSC FOR LOOK
DIA FOR LEA

E.O. 12958: DECL: 2020/02/09
TAGS: [PARM](#) [KACT](#) [MARR](#) [PREL](#) [RS](#) [US](#)
SUBJECT: START FOLLOW-ON NEGOTIATIONS, GENEVA (SFO-GVA-VII):(U)
INSPECTION PROTOCOL WORKING GROUP MEETINGS, DECEMBER 14, 2009

REF: 09 GENEVA 1212(SFO-GVA-VII-162 CABLE 4 OF 12 CABLES)

CLASSIFIED BY: Rose A. Gottemoeller, Assistant Secretary, Department
of State, VCI; REASON: 1.4(B), (D)

[1](#)1. (U) This is SFO-GVA-VII-138.

[1](#)2. (U) Meeting Dates: December 14, 2009

Time: 10:00 A.M. - 1:00 P.M.

Place: U.S. Mission, Geneva

Time: 3:30 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.

Place: U.S. Mission, Geneva

SUMMARY

[1](#)3. (S) The Inspection Protocol Working Group (IPWG), co-chaired by Secretary of Defense Representative Dr. Warner and Russian Ministry of Defense Representative Col Ilin, met twice on December 14, 2009, to review Article XI of the treaty and Sections VI-X of Part V of the Protocol. Discussion focused on inspection activities regarding converted systems, particularly the B-1B and to a lesser extent the SSGNs; ways of making the Protocol less specific and wordy; and parameters and rules for inspections. Of note, the Russian side confirmed that it would list the RS-24 as an existing

type of ICBM in the START Follow-on Treaty. End summary.

¶4. (U) SUBJECT SUMMARY: Article XI - Discussion and to Conforming; Sections VI and VII; Afternoon Session, Section VII; Section VIII-X; The Full Part V of the Protocol to Conforming; Annexes; and Russian Decision-Making on Mobiles.

ARTICLE XI - DISCUSSION AND TO CONFORMING

¶5. (S) The meeting began with a review of Article XI. The U.S. side accepted the Russian formulations in Paragraph 1. For Paragraph 2, the sides discussed the inspection regime for B-1Bs in the "intermediate period" between entry-into-force (EIF) and the full reconversion of the B-1Bs. Warner emphasized that the United States would not accept a prohibition on the co-location of nuclear and non-nuclear heavy bombers. Warner and Ilin agreed to defer to the Agreed Statement being drafted on this matter. Having made some wording changes, the sides agreed to the remainder of Article XI, with the exception of outstanding substantive brackets on the B-1Bs and conversion or elimination exhibitions. The sides agreed to send the Article to conforming.

SECTIONS VI AND VII

¶6. (S) The sides worked through Section VI of Part V of the Protocol. Debate focused on the regime for inspections at submarine bases, particularly with respect to the SSGNs, and on inspections of heavy bombers. Warner took time to encourage the Russians to accept the application of unique identifiers to all systems.

¶7. (S) Ilin devoted special attention to the B-1B issue throughout the morning session, underlining that the conversion process outlined under START had not been satisfactory to the Russians and had left a lingering mistrust. He outlined a proposed three-stage process for the conversion of the B-1Bs, beginning with confirmation by the sides of the procedures to be used; inspections, within the overall quotas, of the conversions of individual B-1Bs; and, finally, a regime for the "intermediate period" during which converted B-1Bs would be co-located with those still awaiting conversion.

¶8. (S) The sides also discussed the matter of measuring covers for reentry vehicles. The Russian side argued for removing discussion of such covers from the Protocol, while the U.S. side pushed for inclusion. Warner explained that it was important to discourage the use of very large, obscuring covers. The sides agreed to return to the issue at a later time.

¶9. (S) The Russians also once again asked for greater specificity in the notifications to be provided on heavy bomber movements. The issue remained unresolved.

¶10. (S) The sides concluded the morning session with a lengthy debate on the necessity of listing facilities in Section VII. The sides were able to agree on some reformulations to accommodate the Russian desire for generality, but other passages remained in brackets.

AFTERNOON SESSION, SECTION VII

¶11. (S) Resuming discussion of Section VII at the afternoon session, the U.S. side handed over a revised version of Section VII. Warner continued to insist that elimination exhibitions not be subtracted from the inspection quota totals. Warner emphasized that this position came from the highest levels of the U.S. Government.

¶12. (S) The U.S. side highlighted revised language on Type 2 inspection rights for formerly declared facilities, noting that heavy bomber air bases would be treated separately at greater

length under the proposed Agreed Statement. Warner took pains to emphasize that the U.S. side would not countenance considering converted heavy bombers nuclear strategic offensive arms following their conversion. A long dispute ensued on the question of inspections of heavy bombers equipped for non-nuclear armaments, without significant progress.

¶13. (S) Continuing on with Section VII, Ilin argued for less specificity in the document's treatment of items subject to pre-inspection movement restrictions. Warner pushed back, arguing that detail was important to avoid ambiguity. Ilin called for bracketing the list of items in Section VII, Paragraph 3 of Part V to the Protocol (Reftel), but in the end the sides came to an agreement on a modified list.

¶14. (S) The sides concluded Section VII, leaving some brackets reflecting major outstanding issues, including on the treatment of heavy bombers equipped for non-nuclear armaments.

SECTION VIII-X

¶15. (S) After the U.S. side handed over a revised version of Section VIII on exhibitions, the sides worked through the text. Warner pointed out that regardless of whether it was declared as a new or existing type, the United States would need a technical characteristics exhibition of the RS-24. The Russian side clarified that it would declare the RS-24 as an existing type and so agreed to the U.S. formulation that exhibitions would be required of all systems not exhibited under START. The sides worked through the remainder of the text, deferring some issues to the Conversion or Elimination Working Group.

¶16. (S) The sides then worked through Sections IX and X and agreed on the text, with a few minor changes.

THE FULL PART V OF THE PROTOCOL TO CONFORMING

¶17. (S) The sides agreed to send the full Part V of the Protocol, albeit with brackets reflecting remaining significant issues to be resolved at a higher level, to the Conforming Group. Warner commented that the principal outstanding issues clustered around the number of annual inspections allocated and how to handle eliminations.

ANNEXES

¶18. (S) Ilin then handed over a very short version of Annex 7, noting that it was more of a "working paper" than a comprehensive text. He urged Warner to agree to defer working on the annexes until a later date. Warner responded that the sides would need to work through the annexes sooner or later and certainly before beginning the formal ratification process. A discussion followed regarding the level of detail required in the annexes, with the U.S. side pushing for greater and the Russian side less.

RUSSIAN DECISION-MAKING ON MOBILES

¶19. (S) During the afternoon session, Ilin criticized the United States for singling out mobiles in one of the Sections of the Protocol. Warner commented that the Russian side had developed an allergy to any mention of mobiles, however reasonable. Col Zaitsev, sympathetic to Warner's point, admitted that, initially, the Russian side had been willing to be more flexible but that "somebody talked to Moscow" and Moscow then instructed the Russian delegation to be allergic to any focus on mobile systems. Ilin then cut Zaitsev off.

¶20. (U) Documents exchanged:

- U.S.:

-- U.S. Revised Proposal for Section VII

- Russia:

-- Russian Working Paper on Annex 7

¶21. (U) Participants:

UNITED STATES

Dr. Warner

Mr. Brown

Mr. Buttrick

Mr. Colby (RO)

LTC Leyde

Ms. Pura

Mr. Rust

Ms. Gesse (Int)

RUSSIA

Col Ilin

Mr. Izrazov

Col Petrov

Col Zaitsev

Ms. Voldopolova

Mr. Pogodin (Int for AM Session)

Ms. Komshilova (Int for PM Session)

¶22. (U) Gottemoeller sends.

LARSON